

From: [Crossland, Ronnie](#)
To: [Edlund, Carl](#)
Cc: [Carroll, Craig](#); [Smith, Monica](#); [Honker, William](#); [R6HarveyInfo](#)
Subject: Mission Assignment Transition from Response to Recovery Document
Date: Sunday, September 17, 2017 9:34:27 PM

Carl,

I think there is a misunderstanding of the National Disaster Recovery Framework. The NDRF is a concept of operations to provide structure in providing support in recovery efforts using EXISTING resources from an Agency's base budget. See the language pulled from the NDRF below:

The *National Disaster Recovery Framework (NDRF)* is a guide to promote effective recovery — it is a concept of operations and not intended to impose new, additional or unfunded net resource requirements on Federal agencies. Instead, the NDRF aims to leverage and concentrate the effects of existing Federal resources, programs, projects and activities through an organization of Recovery Support Functions (RSFs) to promote effective recovery for affected communities before and after disaster strikes. The National Disaster Recovery Planning (NDRP) Division at Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Headquarters facilitates and coordinates RSF activities and recovery planning at the national level. Each RSF coordinating agency will commit to designating a senior level principal to serve as the RSF national coordinator, provide significant engagement and management for the RSF, and ensure ongoing communication and coordination between the primary agencies and support organizations for the RSFs. The RSF national coordinator also ensures coordination and communication between the Federal agencies and corresponding local, State and Tribal authorities and nongovernmental and private-sector organizations throughout the preparedness, response and recovery phases of a disaster.

The NDRF is not intended to increase overall Federal agency activity in support of recovery planning during steady-state. Accordingly, Federal agencies with NDRF roles and responsibilities shall fund the costs arising from those responsibilities out of their base budgets and staffing levels, and, except as noted above, shall only support steady-state NDRF activities subject to available resources.

So if there is something we think we need to do, we have the flexibility to do it without an assignment for recovery. The NDRF just provides some coordination of activities. The only money we might receive, might be a small amount to cover coordination costs. With all this in mind, I don't see the necessity to connect a recovery assignment with TCEQ no longer requiring EPA's assistance under an Emergency Support Function.

With regard to alignment with TCEQ, I totally agree. When TCEQ requests our assistance via

an ESF #10 mission assignment, we should support them. When TCEQ says they no longer need our assistance, we should go back to implementing our programs under our authorities.

Ronnie

From: Edlund, Carl

Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 5:30 PM

To: Crossland, Ronnie <Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov>

Cc: Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>; R6HarveyRICT <R6HarveyRICT@epa.gov>; Smith, Monica <smith.monica@epa.gov>; Honker, William <honker.william@epa.gov>

Subject: Re: Mission Assignment Transition from Response to Recovery Document

Thanks...we still haven't received an assignment for recovery and we do need alignment with TCEQ at all levels.

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 17, 2017, at 2:14 PM, Crossland, Ronnie <Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov> wrote:

Carl and Craig,

Since you asked.

The State of Texas requested federal assistance post hurricane Harvey. For EPA, this request came in the form of a mission assignment under ESF #10. EPA's role is to provide support to the TCEQ until TCEQ no longer requires assistance. So it doesn't mean everything has been accomplished and there is nothing left to do. Just that the state no longer requires federal assistance. In reality, the transition is that EPA's assistance is no longer required and TCEQ will continue its presence and activities. I know the NDOW group came up with this proto type transition document (absent the County Judge), however, I think there are two ways for EPA's assistance to end: 1) the MA expires based on money or time; or 2) TCEQ informs EPA that its assistance is no longer necessary. So, I believe it would be better to have correspondence from TCEQ expressing that EPA's assistance is no longer required instead of the existing draft.

If EPA decides to keep going down the current approach, involving the County Judges in this process is for reasons other than TCEQ no longer requiring EPA's assistance. Therefore, the County Judges should not be included in this document. If EPA feels the need to correspond with County Judges, it can be done outside of this process. In addition, the second paragraph in the draft is also unrelated to EPA's assistance under an ESF #10 mission assignment and thus should not be part of a document where EPA is ending its assistance under an ESF #10 mission assignment. The activities reference in this paragraph deal with recovery which is a totally separate process.

On September 7, 2017, Texas Governor Abbott created the Governor's Commission to Rebuild Texas. EPA agreed to support the Governor's Commission to effectively coordinate the State's effort to recover and rebuild public infrastructure damaged by Hurricane Harvey and will do so under a separate FEMA Mission Assignment for Long-term Recovery if issued by FEMA. The duties of the Commission shall include: assisting local governmental entities and nonprofit organizations to assess and identify rebuilding needs and to navigate state and federal resources available for the rebuilding effort; advocating for the interests of state and local government on matters related to disaster response; and providing expertise and assistance to local governmental entities and nonprofit organizations throughout the rebuilding process.

Just some thoughts,
Ronnie

From: Carroll, Craig
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 12:41 AM
To: Moore, Gary <Moore.Gary@epa.gov>
Cc: R6HarveyRICT <R6HarveyRICT@epa.gov>; Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>; Smith, Monica <smith.monica@epa.gov>; Smalley, Bryant <smalley.bryant@epa.gov>; Hayes, Scott <Hayes.Scott@epa.gov>; Lininger, Don <Lininger.Don@epa.gov>; Snowbarger, Robert <Snowbarger.Robert@epa.gov>; Price, Lisa <Price.Lisa@epa.gov>; Kelly Cook <kelly.cook@tceq.texas.gov>; Crossland, Ronnie <Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Mission Assignment Transition from Response to Recovery Document

Second try with attachment. The dangers of forwarding off the smartphone. Thanks for catching Scott.

Gary, please review with UC to see if all signatories can agree to move forward with this version. Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Carroll, Craig" <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>
Date: September 16, 2017 at 1:58:17 PM CDT
To: "Edlund, Carl" <edlund.carl@epa.gov>
Cc: R6HarveyRICT <R6HarveyRICT@epa.gov>, David Gray <Gray.David@epa.gov>, Monica Smith <Smith.Monica@epa.gov>, "Smalley, Bryant" <smalley.bryant@epa.gov>, Althea Foster <Foster.Althea@epa.gov>, "Lininger, Don" <Lininger.Don@epa.gov>, "Hayes, Scott" <Hayes.Scott@epa.gov>

Subject: Mission Assignment Transition from Response to Recovery Document

Carl,

Attached is the revised version of the transition document. This version is to the County Judge from UC through the TCEQ director. Please provide feedback by 3pm if possible so we can get final version to IMT and discuss on today's Ops call. Thanks

Craig Carroll,
Chief, Emergency Management Branch
214-665-2220